unit and Claim 28 claims a display monitor, which have different components and function differently. In a careful comparison of these two claims, only one element is in common (flat panel display). The other two elements (c) and (d) are not equivalent and are distinct. These elements are nonobviously different, (not suggested by prior art) i.e., the wedge base limitation in Claim 4, and the attachment to base at front of the base in Claim 4 vs. the rear in Claim 28.

As shown in Table 1, the claims have nonobvious differences between each element. The words underlined emphasize specific differences in each claim-to-claim comparison. Dependent claims mentioned in the OA contain more limitations, distinguishing them from their independent claims. The dependents contain many more nonobvious differences than their recited parent claims. For all the above reasons, applicant believes there is no bases for the obviousness-type double patent rejection. Applicant respectfully asks for the claims of this application be allowed.

Claims 24-26, 28 , 31 § 103 (a) Rejected
over Hillary IVO Conway

Examiner rejected Claims 24 -26, 28, 31 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillary in view of Conway. Applicant admits Hillary teaches a stand with various support arms and hinges. However, as examiner admits, Hillary fails to teach a flat panel display. Examiner states that Conway teaches a display device stand. However, applicant disagrees, Conway does not teach a display stand, instead they teach a folding portable notebook computer, which can be arranged in several ways. Conway's split keyboard may support their flat panel display, but in an unstable manner -- this is a critical difference. Conway's support mode cannot be considered as a "display stand".

Webster's New World Dictionary [The World Publishing Company, New York, 1998] defines the verb "stand" as: to stand, be placed, as also in stable. state. station, etc.; and, the noun "stand" to be: " a standing; especially a stopping; halt or stop." Look at Conway's

split keyboard support in Figs. 1, 2 and 3; Conway's support lacks the required stability for a stand, i.e. a stand must be physically stable. Conway's support it lacks both physical halt or resistance to physical forces, such as to normal finger and hand forces.

In addition, Conway does not teach nor anticipate support arms that are critical to applicants claims. The Webster's New World Dictionary defines a "arm" to be: "*n.* 1. an upper limb of the human body. 2. anything immediately resembling this; especially, *a)* a branch of a tree; *b)* a branch of a river." In studying the Conway reference closely, they do not teach any part that can be considered an "arm".

Hillary fails to teach or suggest: 1) flat panel display, 2) front base hinge, or 3) mid point base hinge. Where in Conway or Hillary do they teach what modifications are required to make applicant's claims? Examiners must carefully consider ALL the words (limitations) in the applicant's claims and carefully compare them to the prior art, when determining obviousness or non- obviousness.

As to Claim 24, applicant claims a display device stand without a display device of any type. Both Conway and Hillary fail to teach a stand without a display.

As to Claim 25 and 26, they are both dependent claims of 24, and add limitations to further distinguish them from Conway and Hillary.

As to Claim 28, applicant teaches a flat panel display monitor, with a unique support structure and function, which is not specifically disclosed in this way by Conway, Hillary or other know prior art.

As to Claim 31, applicant teaches a telescoping post, which is not specifically taught in the way by Conway, Hillary or other know prior art.

Claim 29 Rejected Under § 103(a)
Hillary IVO Conway and Park

Applicant agrees that Conway and Park teach a display device comprising battery power. However, Conway, Park and Hillary fail to teach nor suggest the function of removing the display from their other apparatus. There is no teaching in above references that suggests what modifications to make that would result in applicant's claims. None of the prior art reference teach removing the display device. However, applicant's disclosure does teach removing the display device to operate separate from the base. Thus, Claim 29 is non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 27 and 30 Rejected Under § 103(a)
Makita IVO Nagaoka

Makita teaches a display attached two a base unit via two arms attached to the base at the rear of the base. Applicant Claims **27** and **30** teach a display attach to the middle portion of a base unit. Examiner admits Nagaoka fails to disclose support arm position adjustment means. Examiner admits Hillary teaches support arm position adjustment mean (19) connected to the base unit near the end of the base unit (13). The end of the base unit does means front or rear, not near the middle of the base unit. Nagaoka teaches a flat panel display attached near the middle of a base unit. However, Nagaoka's display cannot be adjusted vertically in elevation position adjustment. Elevation adjustment is a key function claimed in applicant's Claim **27** and **30**. Examiner states Makita teaches multi-section telescope post means (19). However, Makita only teaches a singe support are on each side. A pivoting support arm pair (19) is not a telescoping post means. There is absolutely no telescoping post sliding functions in Makita's reference. Therefore, Claims **27** and **30** are non-obvious under the meaning of U.S.C § 103 (a).

Request For Notice Of Allowance

Claims **24 - 31** particularly point out the inventions of the applicant, and the claims are novel, and non-obvious under the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103. **No new matter has been added.** Thus a Notice of Allowance is most respectively solicited.

Attached is Table 1 (page 6 of 6)

Sincerely,

Richard J. Ditzik

Richard J. Ditzik
Applicant Pro Se

307 Surrey Drive
Bonita, CA 91902
(619) 661-2252

Date: 11-16-98

TABLE 1 – COMPARISON OF CLAIMS* FOR NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING, DIFFERENT APPLICATIONS, SAME OWNERSHIP

Note: Some of the non-obvious differences are highlighted via underlining.

* Summary of claims presented here; not all words in the claims are shown in this table.

Indep. Claims of '570 Patent (Ditzik)	Indep. Claims of this Application	Non-obvious Patently Distinct Differences
1. A desktop computer system comprising:	24. A display device stand for holding a flat panel display assembly for resting on top of a roughly flat horizontal surface, comprising:	**Claims 24 and 1:** Claim 24 claims a display stand with a support arm means, support pivot means and a base unit. Claim 1 claims a computer system with a first support arm pair, a second support arm pair, computer
a. a flat display panel assembly defining a display screen and support structure;	a. means for flat panel display assembly pivot and clamping functions;	means, and housing means with connection at *front*. ***A stand and computer are patently distinct.***
b. a first support arm pair physically connected to the display panel assembly via the first hinge pair,	b. a support arm means attached to the hinge and clamping means for supporting and positioning the flat panel display assembly;	**Claims 4 and 24:** Claim 4 claims desktop display with a support hinge pair, support arm means, a pivot means, and wedge base with connection at front. Claim 24 claims a display stand with a support are means, support pivot
c. a second support arm pair connected to the other ends of the first support arm pair via a second hinge pair;	c. a support pivot means attached to the support arm means, working in cooperation for plurality of position adjustments;	means and a base unit. ***A display device and a display stand are patently distinct.***
d. means for digital data computing;	d. a base unit attached to the support pivot means, wherein the base unit provides sufficient mechanical stability.	**Claims 13 and 24:** Claim 13 claims a display unit with telescoping post, wedge base, and one support hinge pair. Claim 24 claims a display stand with a support arm means, support pivot means and a base unit. ***A display***
e. means for housing main electronics having a third hinge pair located near the front corners of the unit; and	Received	***unit is not substantially the same as a display stand. Thus they patently distinct.***
g. the said main housing means being sufficiently large to enclose the computing means.	NOV 2 3 1998	
	Group 2700	
4. A desktop display unit for viewing by the user, which is to be placed onto to the top of a desk or table structure, comprising:	27. A display monitor adapted to rest the monitor on a horizontal surface comprising:	**Claims 27 and 4:** Claim 27 claims display monitor with base unit, base support pivot means, support arm adjustment means at middle of base, panel support pivot and flat panel display. Claim 4 claims desktop display
a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	a. a base unit adapted for resting onto on a roughly horizontal surface or a desk or table;	with a support hinge pair, support arm means, a pivot means, and wedge base with connection at front. ***These physical connections are patently distinct.***
b. a support hinge pair connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	b. a base support pivot means attached to the base unit near the middle of the base unit;	**Claims 27 and 1:** Claim 27 claims display monitor with base unit, base support pivot means at middle of base, support arm adjustment means, panel support pivot and flat panel display. Claim 1 claims a computer system
c. means for support arm position adjustment connected the flat panel display;	c. support arm position adjustment means connected to the base support pivot means for position adjustments;	with a first support arm pair, a second support arm pair, computer means, and housing means with connection at front. ***A display unit is patently distinct from a computer system; they have substantially different functions and structures.***
d. means for pivot connector attached to the bottom portion of the support arm position adjustment means, and	d. a panel support pivot means attached to support arm position adjustment means, and	**Claims 27 and 13:** Claim 27 claims display monitor with base unit, base support pivot means at middle of base, support arm adjustment means, panel support
e. a roughly wedge shape base unit connected to pivot connector means near the front end of the wedge shape base unit.	e. a flat panel display assembly connected to the panel support pivot means near the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly.	pivot and flat panel display. Claim 13 claims a display unit with telescoping post, wedge base, and one support hinge pair. ***A telescoping post is patently distinct from pivot means – they are used for different motions and purposes.***
13. A desktop display unit for computer use by a user, which is to be placed onto to the top of a desk or table structure, comprising:	28. A display monitor on a roughly horizontal surface of a desk or table, comprising:	**Claims 13 and 28:** Claim 13 claims telescoping post, wedge base, and one support hinge pair. Claim 28 claims two support pivot means and a base unit with connection to pivot means at rear. ***(patently distinct see above)***
a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	a. a flat panel display assembly defining a display screen and control electronics;	**Claims 4 and 28:** Claim 4 claims a support hinge pair, support arm means, a pivot means, and wedge base with connection at front. Claim 28 claims a first support pivot, a support arm adjustment means, a second support pivot
b. a support hinge pair connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	b. a first support pivot means connected to the bottom edge of the flat panel display assembly;	means and a base unit with connection to pivot means at rear. ***Connection positions are critical to inventions and are substantially different.***
c. means for telescoping post support connected to the bottom of the support hinge;	c. support arm position adjustment means connected the flat panel display assembly for elevation and inclination position adjustments;	**Claims 1 and 28:** Claim 1 claims a computer system with a first support arm pair, a second support arm pair, computer means, and housing means with connection at
d. a roughly wedge shape base unit attached to telescoping support post means near the front end of the wedge shape base unit, and	d. a second support pivot means attached to support arm position adjustment means . . .; and	front. Claim 28 claims a display monitor with two support pivot means and a base unit with connection to pivot means at rear. ***Display monitor and computer system are substantially different – patently distinct.***
e. said support hinge and the telescoping post means working together.	e. a base unit adapted for resting onto horizontal surfaces, wherein the base unit is connected to the second support pivot means near the rear of the base unit, . . .	